

**Meeting to discuss the Conceptual Site Model and  
Round 2 Site Characterization Summary Report**

April 18, 2006, 10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m. (management meeting follows)

Ater Wynne, 222 SW Columbia Ave., suite 1800, room 19E

Take the elevator to the 18<sup>th</sup> floor then walk upstairs to room 19E.

Conference line available Non-responsive

9:45 Arrive and settle in

10:00 Introduction and opening comments – *EPA and LWG managers*

10:15 **Review the purpose of today's meeting** and our agenda

Our purpose today is threefold:

1. To determine whether EPA/partners and the LWG share a common vision for the CSM, and if not, to identify what's needed to align our thinking and resolve any issues.
2. To agree on the objectives for and contents of the Round 2 Site Characterization Report.
3. To discuss Round 3A sampling tasks and a process for determining the scope of the tasks.

10:30 **Overview and discussion of LWG's proposed CSM** – *Nick Varnum*

*Prior to the meeting, please review the LWG's outline for the proposed Round 2 Site Characterization Summary report, which includes a proposed outline for the CSM (LWG plans to send the outline out via email by 4/14/06).*

Nick will describe the LWG's proposal at the meeting to set the context for our discussion. Team members will identify any changes needed or issues to be resolved to allow agreement between EPA/partners and the LWG on the CSM. Expected outcome: A list of changes needed or issues to be resolved to enable agreement on the CSM.

noon Lunch break – continue CSM discussion or check in with LWG and EPA/partner teams

1:00 **Overview and discussion of Round 2 Site Characterization Report** – *Keith Pine*

*Please review the attached notes from the 4/12/06 Portland Harbor Managers meeting, related to options for developing the Round 2 report.*

Keith will give a brief overview of the proposed Round 2 Site Characterization Summary report and team members will talk about desired objective(s) for the report, what should be in the report, and a process for developing the report and achieving the objective(s). Expected outcome: Agreement on objectives for and contents of the Round 2 report and suggestions for a process to develop the report and ensure that the objectives are achieved.

2:00 **Identifying Round 3A sampling tasks and the scope of those tasks**

*Prior to the meeting, please review the LWG's proposed list of Round 3A sampling tasks (LWG plans to send the list out via email by 4/17/06).*

The team will discuss the LWG's proposed Round 3A sampling tasks, needed changes and an approach for determining the scope of each task. Expected outcome: Agreement on Round 3A sampling tasks (or open technical discussion about needs and issues) and suggestions for a process to determine the scope of each task.

3:00 Adjourn technical meeting; check in meetings with LWG and EPA/partner teams

---

3:15 **Portland Harbor Managers meet** to consider the technical dialogue, resolve outstanding issues (if necessary), and determine follow-up actions needed.

## **ROUND 2 COMP AND DATA GAPS IDENTIFICATION OPTIONS**

### **MEETING NOTES FROM APRIL 12, 2006**

In yesterday's LWG/Gov. Management Team meeting, the outline for the Round 2 Comprehensive Report/Conceptual Site Model (R2C/CSM) was discussed. There was a general concern on the Gov. Team that the data gaps identification was too late to influence Round 3. Several options were discussed. There was no consensus on any particular option, except that further consideration and discussion is needed.

1. **Current outline and schedule** - Under this approach, few, if any, data gaps would be identified in advance of the comprehensive R2 report (November 2006) beyond those currently proposed in the LWG round 3A data gaps.
2. **Dual track approach** – This option would accelerate identification and EPA approval/review of data gaps. This would focus on 3A data gap activities using “off-the-shelf” assumptions or some other approach to get at data gaps. The R2C/CSM report would be pursued in the regular course and additional data gaps could be identified upon completion.
3. **Fast-track using conservative assumptions.** – Prepare the R2C/CSM report on a ‘fast-track’ schedule using literature values and/or published TRVs to develop AOPC delineations earlier. Presently the R2C/CSM requires finalizing some risk tools (BSAFs, FWM, and benthic model) which are on the critical path to completing the R2C/CSM report. Report schedule - tbd.
4. **Fast-track using current LWG approaches.** - A variant of Option 3 is to proceed in developing AOPCs using site-specific risk numbers. The risk numbers would be derived from the current food web model, benthic toxicity, etc, which are not approved by EPA. This approach would require the Agencies and LWG to agree that the risk assessment tools are sufficiently developed to identify data needs but may require further refinement pending EPA review and approval. Report schedule - tbd.